

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated June 7, 2006, which set a three-month period for response. Filed herewith is a Request for a One-month Extension of Time, making this amendment due by October 7, 2006.

Claims 38 – 42 and 48 - 52 are pending in the application.

In the Office Action, claims 43-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,788,038 to Corcoran. Claims 38-42 and 49-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Corcoran.

The Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claim 48 if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In the present amendment, allowable claim 48 has been rewritten in independent form. Dependent claims 49-52 have been amended to depend from allowable claim 48, thus rendering claims 49-52 allowable as well.

Claim 38 has been amended to define additionally that the blade sections are disposed in a plane with the main body. In this connection, it is provided that both cutting angles, specifically, the outer cutting angle 24 and the inner cutting angle 26 (Fig. 2) are measured within the planar blade surface. In this manner, the desired, nearly elliptical contour of the cutting blade can be obtained, also as defined in amended claim 38. Support for the new language added to claim 38 can be found in the specification on page 5, second paragraph, page 6, first paragraph, and page 8, second paragraph.

The arrangement defined in amended claim 38 differs from the cutting blade of Corcoran. According to Diagram 2 provided by the Examiner in the Office Action, the inner cutting edge does have a small angle relative to the longitudinal axis. The outer edge, however, has only a larger angle to the longitudinal axis, because it is angled spatially downward along the dashed line 24, whereby a larger spatial angle exists. The cutting blades in Corcoran, as a result of the bending point with the dashed line 24, do not lie in the same plane as the main body.

On this basis alone, claim 38 as amended is not anticipated by Corcoran. In addition, Corcoran also does not disclose a nearly elliptical contour of the cutting blade, as defined in amended claim 38.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Corcoran is not a proper reference under either MPEP section 2131 or section 2143.03, since the reference does not teach or suggest every element of the claim.

The subject matter of amended claim 38 also is not obvious over the cited references. The cutting blade in Corcoran is formed from a flat base body by bending, as shown in Fig. 1. Thus, with regard to the practitioner using the cutting blade shape on a flat cutting blade in the sense of claim 38, and, if he then were to eliminate bending along the lines 20, 24 of Fig. 3 of Corcoran, then a cutting blade with a contour of Fig. 1 of Corcoran would be the result. There, the outer cutting edges and the inner cutting edges lie in a constant angle to the longitudinal axis. An outer, larger cutting angle for obtaining an almost elliptical contour is not taught by Corcoran and also cannot be derived by combining any of the art of record.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the Applicants respectfully submit that all of claims 38-42 and 48-52 are patentable over the art of record. In addition, should

the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call from him to discuss any outstanding issues, and in particular any further amendments to the claims to bring the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Robert - Becker". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a horizontal line separating the first and last names.

Robert W. Becker, Reg. 26,255
Attorney for Applicant(s)

ROBERT W. BECKER & ASSOCIATES
707 State Highway 333, Suite B
Tijeras, New Mexico 87059

Telephone: 505 286 3511
Telefax: 505 286 3524

RWB:mac